

### **REMARKS**

In response to final Office Action of February 4, 2011 and Advisory Action of March 1, 2011, claims 1, 11, 19, 21, 22, 24, 26, 30, and 40 have been amended to recite "simultaneously displaying a magnified version of the active selection element along with at least one auxiliary element and at least a magnified version of at least a portion of a selection element adjacent the active selection element." A grammatical correction has been made in the specification at page 6, line 11. No new matter is added.

Applicants' undersigned representative would like to thank Examiner Tran for discussing the final Office Action and Advisory Action with undersigned and Attorney Alfred Fressola on April 6, 2011 during an Examiner Interview. During the Interview, Applicants' representatives explained their reasoning for why the cited references fail to render the independent claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. After much discussion between Applicants' representatives and Examiner Tran, Examiner Tran stated to Applicants' representative that in her opinion, the claim does not require that the "magnified version of the active selection along with at least one auxiliary element" and "at least a magnified version of at least a portion of a active selection element adjacent the active selection element" be displayed simultaneously, but if the claims did require that these be displayed simultaneously, then the claim would be non-obvious in view of the cited references, Rowe et al. (U.S. 5,623,613, hereinafter Rowe) and Sciammarella et al. (U.S. 7,051,291, hereinafter Sciammarella).

Although Applicants maintain that the claims as previously presented did require displaying the recited elements simultaneously, in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicants have amended the independent claims as suggested by Examiner Tran, so that the claims explicitly state "simultaneously" displaying. Support for this amendment is found in the original application as filed, including Figures 1 and 2 and page 5, lines 1-27.

Therefore, because independent claims 1, 11, 19, 21, 22, 24, 26, 30 and 40 have been amended as suggested by Examiner Tran to overcome the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also not suggested by Rowe in view of Sciammarella, and are in allowable form.

At least in view of their dependency on the independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4, 6-10, 13-18, 20, 23, 25-27, 29, 32-39 and 41-45 are also in allowable form.

With respect to the rejection of the claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth on page 2 of the final Office Action, Applicants maintain the arguments set forth in Applicants' response dated February 22, 2011 and respectfully submit for those reasons that claim 30 is allowable under § 112, second paragraph. During the Examiner interview, Examiner Tran asserted the rejection should be maintained because the specification did not explicitly recite the word "means". Applicants' representatives expressed their disagreement with this assertion during the interview and pointed out that the specification and claims clearly disclose sufficient structure to support means-plus-function claim 30. No agreement was reached during the interview, and Examiner Tran stated she would reconsider.

Therefore, for the reasons set forth in the response of February 22, 2011, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 30 is definite under § 112, second paragraph, and in allowable form.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The undersigned respectfully submits that no fee is due for filing this Amendment. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to deposit account 23-0442 any fee deficiency required to submit this paper.

Dated: May 2, 2011

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER  
SLUYS & ADOLPHSON LLP  
Building Five, Bradford Green  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676  
USPTO Customer No. 010495

Respectfully submitted,



Steven T. Cooper  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 65,716